



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,670	04/05/2001	Moshe Brody		6750

7590 03/07/2005
Moshe Brody
Rehov Ovadia Ha-Navil 6
Kfar Sava, 44342
ISRAEL

EXAMINER

PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/827,670	BRODY, MOSHE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Pyzocha	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2137

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 and 11-33 are pending.
2. Amendment filed 01/07/2005 has been received and considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Rejections of claims by 35 USC 112 have been withdrawn based on the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-5, 11, 17, 23, 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yahoo Games (hereinafter Yahoo).

As per claim 1, Yahoo discloses in an information stream associated with deliverable published software from a software publisher to a customer, an arrangement for software protection comprising a personalization, said personalization incorporated

Art Unit: 2137

into the information stream by the software publisher prior to delivery of the published software to the customer and prior to receipt of the published software by the customer- and containing pre-existing personal information fundamentally related to the customer (see Yahoo page 6 where the personalization is the name and rating in the right sub window).

As per claim 2, Yahoo discloses the deliverable published software is intended to execute on a plurality of computers, and wherein said personalization is not fundamentally related to any specific computer of the plurality (see Yahoo page 2 and page 6).

As per claim 3, Yahoo discloses the deliverable published software is intended to execute on a plurality of computers, each of the plurality of computers having a configuration and wherein said personalization is not fundamentally related to any specific configuration (see Yahoo page 2).

As per claim 4, Yahoo discloses the deliverable published software is intended to execute on computers belonging to a class of computer, and wherein the deliverable published software executes in substantially identical functional form on substantially all computers of the class of computer (see page 2 where Java runs on the PC class of computers).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claim 5, Yahoo discloses the personalization is not associated with, and does not activate, any usage restriction on the deliverable published software (see pages 2 and 6).

As per claim 11, Yahoo discloses the information stream contains at least one executable module, and wherein said personalization is contained within said at least one executable module (see page 6 where the applet is the module).

As per claim 17, Yahoo discloses at least part of the deliverable published software is written in the Java language (see Yahoo page 2).

As per claim 23, Yahoo discloses the information stream contains at least one executable module operative to writing an output file containing information derived from said personalization, and wherein said information derived from said personalization in said output file is operative to being separately validated (see page 2 where all personalization including rating and games history are written to a personal file webpage).

As per claim 31, Yahoo discloses at least part of said personalization is operative to being displayed on a computer without requiring customer input of said at least part of said personalization (see page 6 where the rating requires no input by the user).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claims 32-33, Yahoo discloses displaying the personalization (see page 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahoo as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wright (Dynamic Data Structures).

As per claims 6-7, Yahoo fails to disclose the personalization does not have a fixed address and extent within the information stream.

However, Wright teaches such limitations (see pages 2-3).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Wright's method of dynamically allocating memory for the personalization of Yahoo.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow memory to be allocated at execution time (see page 2).

Art Unit: 2137

8. Claims 8-9, 16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahoo as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Menezes et al.

As per claim 8, Yahoo fails to disclose authenticating the personalization.

However, Menezes et al teaches authentication (see page 25).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Menezes et al's authentication on the personalization.

Motivation to do so would have been to verify that the information that was created by a user is actually from the user and that it hasn't changed (see Menezes et al page 25).

As per claim 9, the modified Yahoo and Menezes et al method discloses the personalization is in an encrypted form within the information stream (see Menezes et al page 25).

As per claim 16, the modified Yahoo and Menezes et al method discloses the information stream contains at least one executable module having an authentication, and wherein said executable module executes in a secure computer environment operative to validating the authentication (see Menezes et al page 25).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claim 20, the modified Yahoo and Menezes et al method discloses the computer environment operative to executing Java software (see Yahoo page 2).

9. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahoo as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Sommerer (The Java Archive (JAR) File Format).

As per claim 18, Yahoo fails to disclose the deliverable published software being contained in a Java archive.

However, Sommerer teaches the use of a JAR file (see Sommerer).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Sommerer's JAR file to hold Yahoo's computer code.

Motivation to do so would have been that the JAR format allows for compression (see Sommerer page 1).

As per claim 19, the modified Yahoo and Sommerer method discloses the JAR file is signed (see Sommerer page 1).

10. Claims 12, 15, 24-25 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahoo as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Müller (A Survey of Programming Techniques).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claim 12, Yahoo discloses validating personalization information (see page 5).

Yahoo fails to disclose this validation being done in a separate module.

However, Müller teaches the use of modules (see page 3).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Müller's modules to do the validation of Yahoo.

Motivation to do so would have been to enable usage of general procedures in other programs (see Müller page 3).

As per claim 15, the modified Yahoo and Müller system discloses the validation module is further operative, upon not detecting a valid personalization, to initiate an action included in the group containing: (a) program termination; (b) operating the software in a demonstration mode; and (c) operating the software in a restricted mode (see Yahoo page 5).

As per claim 24, the modified Yahoo and Müller system discloses (a) obtaining pre-existing personal customer; (b) producing a personal information module from information fundamentally related to the said pre-existing personal information fundamentally related to the customer; and (c) producing an executable module deriving at least in part from said personal information module and incorporating at least part

Art Unit: 2137

of said pre-existing personal information fundamentally related to the customer wherein at least one of said producing a personal information module and said producing an executable module is performed prior to delivery of the published software to the customer and prior to receipt of the published software by the customer (see Yahoo pages 4-6).

As per claims 28-30, the modified Yahoo and Müller system discloses collecting and building customer information (see Yahoo pages 4-6).

11. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Yahoo and Müller system as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Pratt (US 6070254).

As per claims 13-14, the modified Yahoo and Müller system fails to disclose validating an output file and an execution module.

However, Pratt teaches validation (see column 4 lines 22-32).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Pratt's validation to validate the modified Yahoo and Müller's output and module.

Art Unit: 2137

Motivation to do so would have been to determine if an error has been detected which requires modification of the data (see column 4 lines 33-40).

12. Claims 21-22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Yahoo and Müller system as applied to claims 12 and 24 above, and further in view of Menezes et al.

As per claim 25, the modified Yahoo and Müller system fails to disclose authenticating the personalization.

However, Menezes et al teaches authentication (see page 25).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Menezes et al's authentication on the personalization.

Motivation to do so would have been to verify that the information that was created by a user is actually from the user and that it hasn't changed (see Menezes et al page 25).

As per claims 21-22, the modified Yahoo, Müller and Menezes et al system discloses encryption and decryption using a public key cryptosystem (see page 25).

13. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Yahoo and Müller system as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Sommerer.

Art Unit: 2137

As per claim 26, the modified Yahoo and Müller system fails to disclose incorporating said executable module within a Java archive; and authenticating said Java archive with an archive signature.

However, Sommerer teaches these limitations (see page 1).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Sommerer's JAR file to hold the modified Yahoo and Müller system's computer code.

Motivation to do so would have been that the JAR format allows for compression (see Sommerer page 1).

14. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Yahoo, Müller and Menezes et al system as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Sommerer.

As per claim 27, the modified Yahoo, Müller and Menezes et al system fails to disclose incorporating said executable module within a Java archive; and authenticating said Java archive with an archive signature.

However, Sommerer teaches these limitations (see page 1).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Sommerer's JAR file to hold the modified Yahoo, Müller and Menezes et al system's computer code.

Art Unit: 2137

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 and 11-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2137

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

MJP